# THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. I. MARCH, 1921. No. 3.

## New Thought.

PROF. TH. GRAEBNER, St. Louis, Mo.

"We are not of the earth, earthy, but gods from heaven, for we have always been in heaven and can never get out of heaven. . . . My democracy is the democracy of divinity, for I recognize each human being as a fellow-god. . . . And, my beloved gods and goddesses, we were all there before the earth and before matter, for we are the creators and the originators and operators of this mental universe."

This is New Thought speaking through one of its prophets in *The Nautilus* of December, 1917. (pp. 23—25.) New Thought does many things. It cures a baby of constipation when you say to it, for three days, "You are no longer constipated — you are a perfect being." (p. 37.) It overcomes appendicitis without recourse to the knife. (p. 38.) By speaking "helpful little phrases" before falling into slumber at night, one devotee has become successful in business. (p. 47.) New Thought is just the thing to help one become a successful poultry-raiser (p. 49), and by "investing in an annual subscription to this unparalleled monthly" (*The Nautilus*), the mind is renewed along the line of St. Paul's counsel to "be transformed by the renewing of mind." (p. 52.) But, above all, it assures its believers of their essential identity with the Godhead; not union, but identity. "We are not of the earth, earthy, but gods from heaven." Ralph Waldo Trine, one of its high priests, writes: "Man is god incarnate."

At present there are, if their statistics can be relied upon, about five million gods and goddesses in the world. Of these the greater number are said to live in what has been called the "pay-streak of our civilization," — the band of population stretching along the forty-first degree of latitude. From New York City the cult reports 700,000 adherents, from Pittsburgh 350,000, from

Cincinnati 200,000, and Chicago is said to contain 450,000. While it might appear somewhat sacrilegious to seek verification of statistics supplied by divinity itself, we made bold, on reading these figures, to look into the index of the 1919 census report (*Religious Bodies,* Part I), and were heartened to find New Thought there referred to with a notation "Page 11." However, page 11 disclosed this state of affairs: "There are certain cults which, while claiming a number of adherents, are not so organized as to make their presentation as religious bodies permissible. Among these the strongest is undoubtedly what is known as 'New Thought,' which has an international association, with headquarters at Washington, D. C., and claims large numbers of adherents. There are a number of local 'centers,' but neither these nor the general body have any distinctive membership, most, if not all, of the individuals connected with them being identified, more or less closely, with existing church organizations." Accordingly, the figures quoted above might be viewed as emanations of that optimism which is so pronounced a trait of New Thought. But a parallel with Christian Science here suggests itself. Until 1906, Mrs. Eddy reported the statistics of her cult to the Federal census officers. From 1890 to 1906 a growth of 1,000 per cent. was noted. But after the census of 1906 something happened. Since that date Christian Scientists have given out no information as to their numbers. Mrs. Eddy about that time discovered that the Scriptures command us "to turn away from personality and numbering the people." (*Manual,* Art. 8, Sec. 28.) Her opponents have ever since maintained that a decrease in the rate of growth, if not in growth absolutely, was the real reason for this change of policy, and this is the opinion also of Dr. Carroll, the religious statistician. We may not be far from the truth if we assume that a similar reason lies behind the unwillingness of New Thought to give detailed statistics. Until we have these, we cannot be expected to place any credence in the large totals reported from the greater American cities.

The similarity of New Thought to Christian Science is, however, more than superficial. Its stress on the healing of diseases and its reticence as to numbers are not the only points of resemblance. Moreover, there is an historic connection between the two cults. New Thought writers confess to a certain kinship of their system with Eddyism, not in doctrine and practise only, but through derivation and origin.

In his excellent treatise on Eddyism (*The Truth about Christian Science*), Prof. James H. Snowden has this remark on the tendencies to dissolution in Mrs. Eddy's church: "A significant fact in the history of Christian Science is that the system early began to break up into divisive groups and sects, and has already been prolific in an astonishing number of them. It is so lacking in the coherency and binding unity of rationality and attracts to itself so many peculiar people of aberrant minds and emotional temperaments and erratic individualities, it contains so many seeds of internal disharmony and dissolution, that it is sure to develop its own dissent and disruption. The terrible tyranny of Mrs. Eddy served to hold it together against all rebellion in her lifetime, and still acts as a suppressive and unifying influence, but it could not wholly prevent revolt and secession in her day." One of the movements thus originated is New Thought.

Mr. Horatio W. Dresser, a leader of the new cult, in his recent *History of the New Thought Movement,* gives an account of many of these divisive movements. He says that there was a reaction both against the personality of the "revelator" and against the claims made in her supposed "revelation." "Increasing numbers have departed from her organization to set up for themselves, meanwhile keeping such ideas as had proved of" (commercial) "value."

These movements and societies have sprung up most thickly in the track that Christian Science followed, the "pay streak" running from Massachusetts through Illinois and Colorado to California, through "the regions of wealth and luxury and leisure, of cities and high-tension living, of nervous affections and health resorts." (Snowden.) Mr. Dresser mentions an astonishing number of ephemeral magazines, born to live their little lives in their propagation of these new ideas, bearing such titles as *The Metaphysical Magazine, Practical Ideals, Mind, Unity, The Revealer, The Healer, The Truth Seeker, Eternal Progress, Power, Harmony,* and *Immortality.* Only a very few of these sixty or more publications now remain, the most prominent among the survivals being *Unity* and *The Nautilus.*

The seepage from Christian Science to New Thought continues to the present day. In the *Nautilus,* Miss Elizabeth Towne, a prominent leader of the younger cult, recently reported the defection of four persons who had been Christian Science practitioners for twelve years. They had given offense by *expounding Science and Health,* which is only to be *read.* Miss Towne says

that others are restive under the limitations imposed by the Mother Church. The same authority thus sets forth the difference between Christian Science and New Thought: "New Thought includes all the constructive metaphysical truth that Mrs. Eddy taught, and it includes the realm of common-sense as well" — which is about as clear as pea-soup. But the following is plain enough: "Christian Scientists everywhere are waking up to the fact that revelation is personal and continuous, that revelation did not end with Mrs. Eddy. At present Christian Science is trying too hard to shut off the continuous flow of revelation through all its individuals. All Christian Scientists who are finding the gag rule of the church intolerable may immediately find in the International New Thought Alliance a new home and wider forum." Sometimes the matricidal temper of these propagandists is less reserved in its expression, as when "T. J." (T. J. Shelton of Denver — the Sun-phoner) writes: "Christian Science is one of the shrewdest systems of patent mental medicine that has been promoted on this planet for at least three or four centuries. . . . It is a wonderful achievement in advertising," etc. (*Scientific Christian,* May, 1920.) However, there is a persistence of ideas (or substitutes for ideas) that are characteristic of Eddyism. E. C. Hoffmann of Kansas City, Mo., in one of his tracts refers to the "All-loving Father-Mother God." Sometimes there is a denial of sin and sickness as realities, — "dead beliefs of sorrow, sickness, sin" (*The Light,* St. Louis, May, 1919), and the misbegotten hermeneutics of Christian Science is very evident in passages like these: "Jesus Christ cleansed the lepers (impure minds and desires), raised the dead (dead to the Truth of their Being), and cast out devils (evil, error-thoughts, beliefs, and influences)." (E. C. Hoffmann, tract.) Matt. 21, 39 ("And they caught him, and cast him out of the vineyard, and slew him") is interpreted thus, in a German publication, *Das Wort* (St. Louis, May, 1918): "Die Realisation des grossen *Ich Bin* kann nicht aufrechterhalten bleiben, sondern schwindet schliesslich"! Examples might be multiplied indefinitely.

New Thought stresses in all its modifications the doctrine that thought is *a thing,* and that thinking is identical with its object. This is the central teaching of the system. It is developed from such truisms as: "Our mental actions determine our mental and physical conditions and status." (W. W. Atkinson.) This self-evident truth is the one good dollar on which the cult has issued

its debased currency of thought. By a process of dishonest word-juggling, covered over by metaphysical and semireligious verbiage, this principle is made to assert the identity of thought with its object. Think yourself happy, and you are in a state of happiness, because the thought of happiness is happiness. Think yourself healthy, and you are healthy. Think prosperous thoughts, and money is yours. The terms "demonstrate" and "affirm" are sometimes used as in the Eddyite dialect. A tract says: "AFFIRM: 'I am Prosperous and Successful in all that I undertake to do.' 'Henceforth I seek not good fortune, for I myself am good fortune.'" Then the inevitable: "Thoughts are THINGS." Thus diseases are cured. R. L. Smith was a nervous wreck when he went to see a New Thought practitioner. "I was very weak, and when I went for a walk, my knees would shake, and my head would feel as if I was intoxicated. And when I would walk a block, I would get the feeling as if I wanted to run. He told me that when I had that feeling come over me, I was to stop still and say *'Damn,'* and be determined to be master of myself. With a few trials of this I got stronger." (*The Nautilus,* Dec., 1917.)

In this manner the familiar face of autosuggestion, which has a legitimate place in mental therapeutics, reappears in its New Thought guise. For all its "cures," the cult depends upon this single factor, which is continually reenforced by affirmations of the *Science and Health* type: "There never was any reality in sin, disease, or death." "The greatest lesson man has yet to learn is that all things are good; that evil is no thing; that it seems to be, but in reality is not." "In reality there is neither sin, sickness, nor death. God's law can neither be broken nor set aside." (*In the Sunlight of Health,* Patterson.)

The pseudo-metaphysical trappings in which this simple principle (Thought = Object of Thought) clothes itself vary with the different demonstrators. With T. J. Shelton it is "sun-phoning." With others, it becomes a spiritistic séance, in which the hypnotic power of the demonstrator, through the mental "currents" and "flashes" set up in the circle of sitters, causes a momentary trance state in which those present appear to themselves as divested of corporeity. This is called the demonstration of man's Spiritual Being. Others, more crude, explain that they cause "the oil of God to permeate the lungs" of their patients, and "the great, white light of God to enter their bones." But in whatever form presented, and whatever the verbiage employed, the processes of

suggestion, and the obscure relations of mind and body generally, are the substratum both of the doctrine and practises of the cult.

Frequently, the methods of New Thought are invested with the subtle appeal of the occult. Theosophy bulks large in the system. The astral body, astral radiations, telepathy, spirit communication, are topics frequently treated in its literature. In 1918 a New York "center" advertised: "During the war our special work will be to protect the soldier. BULLET-PROOF THE SOLDIERS AND SAILORS! If you want your boys protected from bullets and sickness, give us their names. No charges. We will protect a limited number in camp or at the front." Absent treatment is given also to persons in financial difficulty and, of course, to the sick, and in the literature there are lessons on "direct healing" and on "nerve force exercises" through "rhythmical breathing." Throughout, "magnetism" and the functions of the "astral body" claim attention. The Hindu doctrine of reincarnation, or transmigration of souls, has a congenial basis in points of view characteristic of New Thought. While not enumerated in the list of acknowledged tenets, it crops out here and there, as appears in the following sentences: "This little earth-life is not the beginning nor the end of man's destiny." "Children in this life without doubt are being rewarded or punished for things done or left undone in a past life." (Quoted by Henry C. Sheldon, in *Theosophy and New Thought.*)

In its optimistic outlook and its emphasis on success as achievable by means of thought, this new religion finds its appeal to the common man, who is readily attracted by such pleasing assurances as this, from Atkinson's *New Thought:* "Health, Happiness, and Prosperity belong to man by right, and may be realized by his recognition of the Principle within him, by the proper exercises of his mental powers." The occult garnishments are intended for the semi- and supereducated, and the result, in bankable papers, is very satisfactory. One St. Louis practitioner is said to have an income of $12,000 a month. Another has openly boasted that he had "made a million" by lecturing in the fashionable hotels. It is distinctly a religion for revenue only.

But it has a more sinister side. While asserting the freedom of their followers to remain in connection with any church of their choice, and while disclaiming any antagonism to the Christian denominations, the leaders of New Thought at times plainly reveal their antichristian bias. We find one writer making the bold

statement that the Church of to-day stands as a barrier to all really advanced religious, philosophic, and scientific thought. "It has become a lifeless organism, a dead body without any real or vital belief in its own teachings." In his excellent little treatise *Theosophy and New Thought,* Prof. H. C. Sheldon correctly states the attitude of the cult as being virtually, if not formally, "Come out from among the churches and find your needs in the new religion now starting upon its course." Prof. Sheldon continues: "In their view the Bible is in no preeminent sense a divine revelation. They see no reason why God should not be supposed to have spoken through Emerson and Walt Whitman as truly as through Moses and Paul. . . . The conception of Christ characteristic of New Thought is purely humanitarian. To be sure, entire readiness is shown to ascribe to Him divinity or deity. But that form of description is not regarded as bespeaking for Him any exclusive distinction. He may be characterized as *a* God-man, but not as *the* God-man. He may have been somewhat extraordinary in the clarity of His recognition of his oneness with God; in this, however, He simply put on exhibition the normal man. There is no ground whatever for believing that His personality differed from that of other men. He stands before us as the moral ideal, and fulfils the office of Savior by example." This summary is very accurate and just.

It is a well-established habit to designate man as a part of God. The following are characteristic statements: "All minds are substantially parts of one omnipresent mind, which is the basis of all manifestation." "There is no difference between the great universal Soul and the individual soul." The instances in which the divine name is given to man are almost without number. The following quoted by Prof. Sheldon from Trine and Newcomb are fairly characteristic: "Man is God incarnate." "Cast thyself into the will of God, and thou shalt become as God. For thou art God if thy will be the divine will." "God is Love. God is Law. We are Law. God and Love and Law are One. We are Love. We are One. We are God." E. C. Hartmann has this, addressed to God: "Thou art I, and I am Thou." "In the name of Jesus Christ, my Divine Self —," "My Being, my Divine God-made Christ-Self," etc. Atkinson gives this definition of New Thought: "The recognition, realization, and manifestation of the God in me."

The *moral* corollaries of this self-deification are thus pointed out by Prof. Sheldon: "The inclusion of man in God, the making

him a veritable part of Deity, prepares a difficult situation for the champions of New Thought when they address themselves to the question of the reality of sin, sickness, suffering, and death. It is somewhat enigmatic that a veritable part of the perfect and Holy One should be a subject for any form of evil, and especially of moral evil. In dealing with this difficulty New Thought expositors have been pushed into a kind of apology for evil, moral delinquency included. They are led to define sin as a means to something higher than itself, or as purely negative, or as a lack of development, or as a partial expression of life, or as a product of ignorance. Their writings abound in such sentences as these: 'When fully interpreted, evil ceases to be evil, and becomes educational experience.' 'Good and evil are merely comparative terms — labels, one might say, for different degrees of attainment.'"

"On the New Thought basis the publican made a fool of himself when he prayed, 'God be merciful to me a sinner!' He ought rather to have said: 'O Lord, I gladly recognize that I am as good as you are. I am God incarnate.' As for the Pharisee, he was perfectly right in so far as he took a high view of himself. His mistake was that he did not clearly recognize his own essential divinity, and the equal divinity of all men. In neither the publican nor the Pharisee could a broken and contrite spirit properly be required."

The limit of blasphemy is reached in the writings of the "Sun-phoner," Thomas J. Shelton of Denver. He says in his organ, the *Scientific Christian* (!): "Man is an Autocrat! Self-ruling and self-existing Autocrat of the Universe!" But this is mild. Hear him rave: "My office is in the Sun! It does not matter where my satanic" (material?) "self may happen to be; you can always find me in the sun." "My satanic body is in three dimensions; it is the devil, has always been the devil, and will always be the devil. My satanic vibrations are essential to the health of the universe." Worse is to come. Shelton invariably refers to himself (as do other New Thought writers occasionally) as the I AM, and he identifies himself with Christ to such a degree that he continually cites sayings of Christ without quotation marks. He assures his Sun-phoners: "You are the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. You are he who was, and is and is to be, the Almighty." Concerning the Christ of the gospels he says: "Throw that picture into the waste-basket; you think of the meek and lowly Jesus that was crucified when you look at the picture mortal

mind has placed before our eyes as Jesus." Then he identifies himself with the true, the cosmic Christ: "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life. The I AM that I AM speaks to the I AM that you are. This Word is sometimes the very lightning of the satanic. You are to be awakened to your own divinity. The Word was made flesh! Do you get that statement? The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us. The flesh is not a non-reality; it is the devil, but it is a real devil"—!! Pages and pages of this, in small type. Not even the *Doctrine and Covenants* of Mormonism, possibly the most blasphemous book ever written, rises to such horribly grotesque defilements of the Son of God.

New Thought is not interesting. Its literature nauseates with its ceaseless repetition of *banal* commonplaces and sweetish optimisms. The commercial appeal is blatant, shameless. Its fake occultism deserves the term which Thomas Huxley applied to spiritualism: "Intellectual whoredom." Its blasphemies are blood-curdling. But its dulness and its pointless chattering are, after all, its outstanding feature. Yet even in this there is a deep Satanism. As in the case of *Science and Health,* the reader who forces himself to the task and pores over the pages of New Thought literature soon falls into a condition of mental dizziness, the reasoning faculties are benumbed, and *suggestion* dominates the intellect. New Thought will pass away; but while it lasts, it looms a maleficent upas-tree, with flowers of evil and its leaves glistering with sensuousness.

---

## A Series of Lenten Addresses.

**Delivered at the American Theater, St. Louis, March 1—5, 1920.**

REV. H. B. HEMMETER, Rochester, N. Y.

### IV. "I Am the Resurrection and the Life."

JOHN 11, 25.

The question of a future life is prominent in the minds of the people to-day. The awful mortality of the recent World War, the very natural interest of millions of aching hearts in their ruthlessly slain dear ones, have forced this question into the foreground, and keep it agitated in our newspapers, our magazines, on our picture screens, and most of all in our own hearts.

But how solve the question, the Great Question, as it has been called?

The spiritism of our age is one effort at a solution. Groping in the dark, reaching out into the dark, it produces that which is dark. Listening for voices from the surmised beyond, calling on the departed spirits, consulting the dead, so-called students of psychic science are seeking to delve into the depths of the unseen and to coax messages from the realms of those whom death has stilled. And they tell us of their conviction that there is another life. Dark is their art; especially dark to those of us to whom according to the sacred Book this all is an abomination unto the Lord.

But, how interesting therefore to us should be the words of Jesus: "I *am* the Resurrection and the Life"!

These words Jesus spoke to Martha while He was on His way to Lazarus', her brother's, grave. To illustrate and to illumine them, He raised Lazarus from the dead and returned him to his sisters alive. How glorious! Jesus has the power over death. He can make alive.

A greater emphasis and illustration these words of Jesus, however, were to receive but a few days later. For Jesus was put to death, according to the Scriptures. They crucified Him, and laid Him away in Joseph of Arimathea's tomb. But on the third day, according to His own words to His disciples, the angel in the tomb declared to the affrighted women: "Ye seek Jesus of Nazareth. He is not here; He is risen. Behold the place where they laid Him." Yes, Jesus rose again from the dead and declared Himself the Victor over death and the Lord of Life.

The real emphasis and meaning of this act of Jesus is found in the words of the apostle: "Him God raised up, having loosed the bands of death, since it was impossible that He should be holden of it." For when Jesus raised Lazarus from the dead, then death was not changed, death thereafter remained the same that it had been before. It had merely submitted to superior power. But when Jesus rose from the dead, then death itself received a mortal wound. Death had swallowed more than it could hold when it engulfed Jesus. Jesus loosed its bands, ruptured its muscles, forced death to give up its prey; yes, to become the fertile mother of new life. In the death of Jesus, death was swallowed up in victory. And why?

The apostle says: "Since it was impossible that He should be holden of it." It was impossible. Why? Jesus, the Lamb of God, by His suffering and death had taken away the sin of the world. And all the power of death lay embodied in the sin

of the world. Sin being atoned for, the sting of death was taken from it, and death became an empty form, powerless. It could not hold Him who had vanquished sin. It was impossible. Again, why? Because He was the Son of God, God Himself, the Lord of Life. It would have been a contradiction in itself if death, the creature, deriving all its power from the curse of the Creator, had been able to hold God Himself. If death had been able to destroy life, then in that destruction there would have been involved the destruction of all that is, God Himself. "It was impossible that *He* should be holden of it."

In this light Jesus stands before the world and says: "I am the Resurrection and the Life." Jesus, Himself the Lord of Life, has satisfied God's wrath over sin, has taken the sting from death, has rendered death powerless, has transformed it into a sleep from which there is a glorious awaking.

The fact of our text is full of comfort for the dying world; for it impresses the lesson that death does not end all. Temporal death, indeed, even outside of Jesus, is not the end, but rather the emphasized beginning of that eternal punishment which sin and the consequent separation from God inflicts upon rebellious man. But even without the full realization of this terribleness of death, even temporal death is horrible to all. Jesus standing before the world, however, as the Lord of Life and Death, transforms temporal death. The horror of annihilation vanishes, and the constructiveness of sleep spreads its hue all over death. No, death shall not end all! The dead shall rise. Jesus says: "I am the Resurrection and the Life." What a luster this throws over the dying world! How it disperses the gloominess of our cemeteries! In the light of this message the furrows grow mellow, the ground breaks everywhere, in spirit we can see the very dead come forth. Aye, before us is the harvest of which Jesus Himself is the first-fruits!

But mark, He also says that some shall rise "to everlasting torment." Why some? Is it on account of their persons? They are all sinners. Is it on account of the Savior's purpose? He died for all. Why then?

Jesus says: "He that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live." Faith is the decisive factor, — faith which looks to Jesus, encloses Him, trusts in Him.

Have you this faith?

Old Job, living in the days of Abraham, had this faith; for he confessed in the face of death: "I know that my Redeemer

liveth, and that He shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold and not another."

St. Paul had it when he shouted: "Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the Law. But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

May God grant us that faith through Him that has said: "I am the Resurrection and the Life" — Jesus!

## V. "Behold the Lamb of God, which Taketh Away the Sin of the World."

JOHN 1, 29.

The Christian Church confesses Jesus. It takes its name from Him, proclaims Him as its Leader and its Lord.

Not all so-called Christian churches, however, agree in their opinions of Jesus. In fact, there are many opinions abroad concerning Him. As in the days of Jesus, when some said that He was Elias, some that He was that great prophet, and some had no definite opinion at all concerning Him, so even now there are varying notions held of Him, and the question still seems to be: "What think ye of Christ?"

Of prime importance to us in this connection is the testimony of Peter and the statement of Jesus on that memorable occasion when the disciples had informed Jesus of the opinions concerning Him among the people at that time. Jesus then asked them: "And whom say ye that the Son of Man is?" Peter said: "We believe that Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God." Here is a clear testimony to the point. Peter says: "Thou art the Christ." Every Jew could know what that meant. "Christ," that is "Messiah," that is the "Anointed One," the One of whom Moses and the prophets spake from the beginning that through Him salvation was to come, the "blessing" of God upon the families of the earth. Peter says: "Thou art the Christ," that One who by suffering Himself is to heal suffering mankind. And more. Thou art "the Son of the Living God." Thou Jesus of Nazareth, Thou Christ, art that one of whom Isaiah speaks as the "Immanuel," the "God with us," and of whom he says that His name shall be called "the mighty God." Yea, Thou art the divine Savior,

the "Jehoshua," Jehovah's Savior. Surely, this testimony of Peter is clear. And what does Jesus say? Does He command him to be still? Does He call Peter's attention to blasphemy? Does He modify the evident meaning of Peter's words? Not at all. In reply to Peter's words, Jesus says to Peter: "Blessed art thou Simon, bar Jona." In other words, Simon, Son of Jona, you are not deceived; you have an opinion of Me that makes you a blessed man, blessed in the sense that God blesses. And this opinion, which is nothing else than the truth, you have not of yourself, "flesh and blood has not revealed it unto you, but My Father which is in heaven." This opinion is the truth that God only can reveal to the human heart. It is God's own truth.

A similar testimony, of like import and importance, we have in our text. John had baptized Jesus the day before. There at Jordan John had seen Jesus standing in the water, had seen the Holy Spirit descending on Jesus, and had heard the voice of the Father from heaven saying: "This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Inspired by God, confirmed by the experience just related, John now declares: "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."

Yes, Jesus is God's own beloved Son. In Jesus, God, offended by the transgression of man, is well pleased. And this Jesus is Jehovah's Savior, who takes away, removes, the sin of the world, thus becoming the Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus. Jesus is God's sacrifice, God's own Lamb for the slaughter, who in the form of man was capable of suffering as all men's substitute, and as God was sufficient to appease the wrath of God because of sin and to render a satisfaction for sin that might avail for all and for all time.

Oh, therefore, "behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."

Reconsidering then, we note here: —

Our text presupposes sin. It presupposes the first sin through which sin came into the world. It presupposes that sin, called original sin, which is ours by birth, and which consists in the depravity of our whole human nature, deprived of its original righteousness, inclined toward evil. It presupposes that sin which like a mountain is heaped up upon our race by sinful actions in desires, thoughts, words, and deeds. Yes, it presupposes the sin of the world.

Our text presupposes divine displeasure, God's curse, under which the world lies and suffers and groans and dies; the dis-

pleasure that inflicts as the necessary consequence of sin that separation from light and life and all true happiness under which the world is restless and irresistibly moving on to despair.

Our text presupposes the divine plan of sacrifice. It opens to our eyes the vision of God decreeing to seek and to save deluded and lost mankind, promising the Woman's Seed, Abraham's Seed in whom the families of the earth should be blessed, the Shiloh, man of rest, David's Son and David's Lord, Wonderful, Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace; yes, it opens the eyes to see the great Paschal Lamb prefigured by all the sacrifices from Abel down to the birth of Jesus at Bethlehem, the despised and rejected of men, who was wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquity.

Our text declares the divine participation in the person and work of Jesus. It visualizes the words of Jesus to Nicodemus: "*God so loved* the world that He gave His only-begotten Son," and again to His mother: "Wist ye not that I must be about My Father's business?"

Our text declares the all-sufficiency of Jesus' sacrifice. Jesus "taketh away" the sin of the world; that word "taketh away" in the original signifies to take hold of and remove. Jesus lifts the world's sin from the world's shoulders, as it were, and removes the heavy load. He "taketh *away*" the sin of the world. His work is sufficient, Jesus is what His name implies, the complete and perfect Savior.

May we, then, hear the cry of Christ's forerunner, John: "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." Thus John preached Christ in harmony with the angel's message: "Fear not; for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy; . . . for unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Savior, which is Christ the Lord."

"Whom say ye that Christ is?"

Does some one say that it is all too wonderful and hard to believe? We admit it. Jesus Himself said to Peter: "Flesh and blood hath not revealed this unto thee." We cannot of our own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ, our Lord, or come to Him. However, Jesus shows the way. The Father, which is in heaven, He can reveal it unto us. And He has given us the Word that is Spirit and Truth of which Jesus has said: "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of Me." Read the Bible: faith "cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God."

# The Authenticity of Matt. 6, 13b and of 1 John 5, 7.

Rev. P. E. Kretzmann, Ph. D., St. Louis, Mo.

We Lutherans are no exponents of higher criticism, especially not in the form in which it has been practised by certain liberal and radical theologians during the last one hundred and fifty years, both here and abroad. To approach the Bible in a subjective attitude, to presume upon an explanation of its eternal verities with preconceived notions, that is to us blasphemy, pure and simple. But this does not mean that we are, by principle, averse to a sane criticism of the transmitted text. The sciences of Isagogics and Hermeneutics are not relegated by us into a dim background, but are taught and utilized by us as the basis for sound exegetical work. So much being understood, the chances are that the present discussion may prove of some value.

So far as the doxology of the Lord's Prayer, Matt. 6, 13 b, is concerned, its authenticity and canonicity has been called into question since the publication of the Complutensian Polyglot (1513 to 1517). Erasmus, and afterward Beza, agreed with the editors of this momentous work. Since their time the question has been debated, occasionally with great vigor, by Bible students and commentators. The Catholic writers, almost to a man, reject the passage, since it does not occur in the Vulgate, and therefore is missing also in Wyclif's translation of 1380, in the German translation by Van Ess, and in the Rheims Version of 1582. Luther did not include the doxology in his early explanations of 1518 and 1519 (St. Louis Ed., 7, 712—821), although he included a short exposition in his commentary on Matt. 5—7 of 1532 (7, 510). The words are found in the Textus Receptus, but have since been rejected by the majority of Protestant scholars, including all those most prominent in the field of textual criticism, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Lachmann, Westcott and Hort, Nestle, Souter, and others, one notable exception being Scrivener, who defended the genuineness of the passage with much vigor (*A Supplement to the Authorized English Version of the New Testament,* 1845). There is also a recent able summary in favor of its authenticity (*Hom. Mag.,* 1919, 567 f.).

The facts which speak against the genuineness of the passage are the following. It is not found in the most ancient and most reliable uncial manuscripts, in the Sinaiticus (4th century), the Vaticanus (4th century), the Cantabrigiensis, or Codex Bezae (5th or 6th century), and the Dublinensis rescriptus (6th century), nor is it contained in at least five cursives, namely, Nos. 1, 17, 118,

130, and 209 (all of a much later date). The Latin fathers, Tertullian (who calls the sixth and seventh petitions the *clausula* of the prayer), Cyprian, Jerome, Augustine, have no notes upon it. The Alexandrine codices did not contain the doxology, for it is missing in Origen and in the Coptic Version, at least in that of the northern dialect. It is found neither in the Arabian nor the Persian versions, and Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nyssa, Maximus Confessor, and Caesarius make no mention of it. Moreover, it is strange that Euthymius Zigabenus, the great Byzantine theologian, in the fragments of his *Panoplia,* accuses the Bogomiles of rejecting the *epiphonema* of the Lord's Prayer, as added by the fathers: *to para ton theion phosteron kai tes ekklesias kathegeton prostethen akroteleution epiphonema — to hoti sou estin he basileia kai he doxa tou patros kai tou hyiou kai tou hagiou pneumatos — oude akousai anechontai.*

The weight of evidence against the genuineness of the doxology becomes still heavier if we consider that none of the earlier texts exhibit the formula as the Textus Receptus has it, or as it was found in the later cursives. The *Didache* (1st or 2d century) simply has: *hoti sou estin he dynamis kai he doxa eis tous aionas* (Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers,* I, 320). *The Apostolic Constitutions* (Book VII, chapter 24) has: *hoti sou estin he basileia eis tous aionas, amen.* In the Sahidic or Thebaic Egyptian Version the formula has: *he dynamis kai to kratos.* In two cursives of the 12th century, namely, Nos. 157 (Rome) and 225 (Vienna), there is an addition after *doxa tou patros kai tou hyiou kai hagiou pneumatos.*

The objection is made that the doxology is found in the Syriac Versions, especially in the Peshitta of the second century. This is true; and it is a fact, also, that Chrysostom (*In Matthaeum,* Homilia XX, Ed. Frankofurti ad Moenum, Col., 246) has the verse: *hoti sou estin he basileia kai he dynamis kai he doxa eis tous aionas, amen.* These two, however, are the only real witnesses which can be brought in defense of the passage, for the other Syriac versions, the Philoxeniana and the Hierosolymitana, as well as the Ethiopic, the Armenian, the Gothic, and the Gregorian versions were not in existence before the fourth century.

The explanation for the interpolation of the doxology in the later manuscripts, especially in the cursives, is probably the following. From the beginning, the influence of the Jewish liturgy upon that of the Apostolic Church, as Cabrol (*Monumenta ecclesiae liturgica,* Vol. I) and others have shown, was very strong, and

an examination of the synagog prayers, as they have been preserved through the centuries, shows a verbal agreement of the several clauses of the doxology. It seems, therefore, that the conclusion of the Lord's Prayer was added on the basis of the Jewish liturgy and 2 Tim. 4, 18. This was done at a very early date, probably before the end of the first century. Various formulas were in use, as the Oriental liturgies show, but the one found in the Peshitta and in Chrysostom was interpolated in some manuscripts and found general acceptance, especially in the Orient. Incidentally, we agree with Schaff, when he writes: "No one can doubt the eminent propriety of this solemn conclusion which we are accustomed to regard from infancy as an integral part of the prayer of prayers, and which we would now never think of sacrificing to critical considerations in our popular Bibles and public and private devotions" (Lange-Schaff, *Matthew,* 568). —

The decision as to the genuineness of 1 John 5, 7 is almost as difficult. Luther remarks on this verse: "It seems that this verse was inserted by the orthodox with reference to the Arians, which insertion, however, was not congruous, because he does not speak of the witnesses in heaven, but of the witnesses on earth, in either case" (9, 1507 f.). This was in 1527. In 1529 and 1530 Luther evidently had a later edition of the Erasmian New Testament, for he explains verse 7 without comment as to its authenticity (9, 1636). In his *Church Postil* the words are omitted (12, 535). Among recent Lutheran writers in this country, opinions are divided (*Hom. Mag.,* 28 [1904], 104; Zorn, *Die drei Episteln Sankt Johannis,* 30).

The manuscript evidence is overwhelmingly opposed to the passage, since the latter is not found in any of the uncials, and in none of the cursives till the fourteenth or the fifteenth century, namely, in codex rescr. 173, in numbers 34 and 162, and 61 (Dublin), and 629. The words are also missing in practically all the ancient versions, and are not found in the Latin versions before the eighth century. Not one of the older Greek fathers quotes the verse, nor is it referred to by any of the older Latin fathers.

Some writers, it is true, have objected to this statement, naming Tertullian (d. 220 or 240), Cyprian (d. 258), and Phoebadius (bishop of Aginnum, near Bordeaux, d. after 392) as men who had used this passage in arguments. But a close examination of the passages in question does not bear this out. Tertullian writes: *Connexus Patris in Filio et Filii in Paracleto, tres efficit cohaerentes*

*alterum ex altero; qui tres unum sunt, non unus, quomodo dictum est, Ego et Pater unum sumus* [John 10, 30], (*Adversus Praxean,* cap. 25). Thus he expressly takes his proof-text from the Gospel of John, not from the Epistle. The words of Cyprian are: *Dicit Dominus: Ego et Pater unum sumus, et iterum de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto scriptum est:* ET HI TRES UNUM SUNT ( *De Unitate Ecclesiae*). But his reference is to verse 8, according to the later symbolical interpretation, which identified *pneuma, hydor,* and *haima* with the three persons of the Godhead. (Cp. the *Scholia* of Matthaei and the explanation given by Facundus of Hermiane in the 6th century.) The passage from Phoebadius reads: *Unum tam Deus,* QUIA TRES UNUM SUNT (*Contra Arianos,* cap. 45; Migne, *Patrologia Latina,* 20, 31—50), a reference which is not complete enough to permit definite conclusions.

There is only one reference which cannot be questioned, namely, that reported from the *Conventus generalis episcoporum catholicorum diversarum provinciarum Africae,* A. D. 484 (Mansi, 7, 1149). There we read, under the heading: *B. Eugenii episcopi carthaginensis fidei catholicae ratio: Et ut adhuc luce clarius unius divinitatis esse cum Patre et Filio Spiritum Sanctum doceamus, Joannis evangelista testimonio comprobatur; ait namque, Tres sunt, qui testimonium dant (perhibent) in coelo, Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus Sanctus, et hi tres unum sunt.* This testimony is so clear that it permits of but two explanations: either there was a manuscript in use in North Africa which contained the words or the interpolation on the basis of Cyprian's allegorical interpretation had been generally accepted.

With this one exception, it seems certain beyond a reasonable doubt that verse 7 is a later addition, being usually ascribed to the time of Priscillian (d. 385), and after him to Vigilius of Thapsus, about a century later. The verse was originally in Latin, the Greek translation being inserted in the *Complutensian Polyglot* after the transactions of the Lateran Council of 1215. Erasmus did not accept the verse in his editions of 1516 and 1518, but yielded to the pressure of the Church in 1522, because it was contained in the *Codex Britannicus* (No. 34). Robert Stephanus followed Erasmus in 1546—1569, Beza in 1565—1576, and so the words found their way into the Textus Receptus. In the German versions, that is, the Wittenberg Bibles, the verse does not appear between 1522 and 1545. As much as we love the passage, and as truly as we know that it contains divine truth, we cannot let our subjective attitude set aside incontrovertible objective facts.

# The Road to Success, or Self-Improvement.

Rev. F. E. Pasche, Morris, Minn.

(Continued from the *Theological Quarterly*.)

Cheerfulness and humor give brightness to the face, sunshine to the eyes, relieve the high tension of an argument or oration, and illuminate thought with their light and splendor. Draw up the blinds of your thoughts, open the windows of your heart, and glorify your life with sunshine. Banish all unpleasant thoughts. Be always in a happy, cheerful mood. "A merry heart doeth good like a medicine," says Solomon. Tune your mind to harmony for sleep. Clear up that cloudy countenance! Refresh, renew, rejuvenate yourself. Never go to sleep without erasing every unfortunate impression, every disagreeable experience, every unkind thought, from the mind. "Where care watches, sleep will never lie." (Shakespeare.) Imagine that the words "Good Cheer" are written all over your sleeping-room in letters of light.

Let the bright sunlight shine into your daily life. The oil of gladness makes smoother all the pathways of life. Do not permit worry to overshadow your vocation. We often see nothing but dark clouds floating overhead; but behind them is the glory of the sun. If at times it seems as if God were burdening us too much, as though the affliction lasted too long, there beeing seemingly no end, that finally we must succumb to it — nevertheless persevere, for God knows how much His child can bear. "God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it." 1 Cor. 10, 13. As a wise mariner never overloads his ship, lest it sink, so God never overburdens His child, lest it succumb. So, then, be of good cheer, have patience and say, "We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed, but not in despair." 2 Cor. 4, 8. "In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer: I have overcome the world." John 16, 33. "Ye shall be sorrowful, but your sorrow shall be turned into joy." John 16, 20. "Rejoice in the Lord alway: and again I say, Rejoice." Phil. 4, 4.

Worry is a black monster, which has made many a man a physical wreck — a victim of nerves and moods; it has dwarfed them mentally and morally, and robbed them of the spontaneity and elasticity of youth; it has deprived them of needed rest and recreation, or amusement of any kind; it has made them brutes in their homes and a nuisance to their fellow-men by nervous irritability; it has hardened their sympathies, blighted their aspira-

tions, and crushed their hopes; it has sapped their courage, their self-respect, and their self-control; it shows us the specter of poverty, danger, failure, and shame.

Is this what the Creator has intended for us? Shall we sit in deepest gloom, mourn over departed joys, tremble, and despair? Decidedly not. He bids the sad-hearted rejoice. The Creator has bidden every man look up, not down. Religion casts about one an atmosphere of sunshine. The habit of looking down, talking down, is fatal to advancement. The Creator made us to climb, not to grovel. He is able to furnish enough for all. There is an abundance of food here, that will serve us all plentifully. There is plenty for everybody. And all who perceive and acknowledge this, pray, praise, and give thanks. They exclaim: "O may this bounteous God through all our life be with us, and cheer us with ever joyful hearts and blessed peace, and keep us in His grace, guide us when perplexed, and free us from all ills."

But, alas! most men are ungrateful; they wickedly forget the divine benefits, which is indeed very shameful; and properly is such an ungrateful soul reprimanded, "Do ye thus requite the Lord, O foolish people and unwise?" Deut. 32, 6. Ingratitude is a boisterous wind that dries up the dew of divine grace. Whosoever is ungrateful for what he has received is not worthy to receive more. Yea, great afflictions and punishments must come down upon those who are ungrateful to the Most High, and there will be no end of trouble and worrying for them. But he who shows gratitude for blessings received moves God to bestow still greater blessings upon him, and this will be to him the richest source of happiness and cheerfulness.

Something must be wrong when those who have inherited infinite supply are worrying about their daily bread, are dogged by fear and anxiety so that they cannot take any peace; that their lives are one battle with want; that they are always under the harrow of worry, always anxious. There is something wrong when people are so worried and absorbed mentally by a poverty-stricken attitude that it drives away all their happiness. God is not to blame. He is not dead. He has not withdrawn His hand from this world. He has not forsaken His work, as the architect leaves the house when it is finished, but He preserves all things and governs them by His paternal providence. God is not unconcerned about the affairs on earth. Of His government of the world the Psalmist says: "The Lord looketh from heaven; He beholdeth all the sons of men. From the place of His habitation He looketh

upon all the inhabitants of the earth. He fashioneth their hearts alike; He considereth all their works." All things and all the affairs of men are in His hands, subject to His control and direction. Even to the smallest and most trifling matters does His government extend. God cares for the sparrows; one of them shall not fall to the ground without His permission. If He cares for the meanest of His creatures, will He not care for us, His children, whom He has bought with a most precious price? Why, "the very hairs of your head are all numbered." And though troubles and afflictions may assail us, yet there shall not be a real evil in them, for they come from the loving hand of God, our heavenly Father, and are not sent for our hurt, but for our good. He overrules the evil designs of our enemies and turns them into good for us, as Joseph spoke to his brothers: "Ye thought evil against me, but God meant it unto good." Not only did Joseph become a great man, but through him God saved much people alive. In brief, God is not dead, but He lives and cares for us. We Christians know that our heavenly Father is good to His children. "We know that all things work together for good to them that love God." Hence we are exhorted: "Commit thy way unto the Lord, trust also in Him, and He shall bring it to pass."

We were made for happiness, to express joy and gladness, to be prosperous and cheerful. The trouble with us is that we do not trust God as we should, and consequently do not pray to Him so that His abundance can flow to us. In other words, we keep our minds so pinched, and our faith in our heavenly Father, who daily and richly provides for all, is so small, so narrow, that we strangle the inflow of supply. Murmuring people have a very sad, gray world. The trouble is not in the supply. God's bounty is as boundless as the sea, His love as deep. There is abundance awaiting every one on the globe. "Ask, and it shall be given you." Matt. 7, 7. Have we trials and temptations? Do troubles and cares cumber us like a load? Are we weak and discouraged? Let us take it to the Lord in prayer. We do not ask half enough, hence the meagerness. We are content with too little of the things worth while. It was intended that we should have plenty of everything that is good for us. No one was meant to live in poverty and wretchedness.

Grateful hearts see bounty everywhere. "Having nothing, yet possessing all things," sang the Apostle Paul. If one hope fails, that is not the end of hope; if one door closes, many others will open. Believe firmly that God will provide you with all that you

need to support your body and life, and that He will defend you against all danger, guard and protect you from all evil. Every evening lay down your head with the assuring thought: God's holy angel is near me; I need not fear my enemies, for He protects me; my faithful Guide will never leave me; I may dwell in peace and safety.

Erase, therefore, all the doubts and fears of evil, of danger, of poverty, and all the shadows of failure and shame from your mind, and do not worry. Smile and look happy, as you go about your work; carry sunshine. "Your sorrow shall be turned into joy." John 16, 20. The April showers are to bring May flowers. Worrying means discouragement, fear, doubt, lack of confidence in God's power to help, distrusting God; but these are the germs which have killed the prosperity and happiness of tens of thousands. Be, therefore, delightful and pleasurable. Let everything about you seem to rejoice in the light of your countenance.

A beautiful, sunny temper is no sign of weakness, as many suppose, but of strength and harmony of character. It shows that there is a power seated at the center of the being that knows how to administer the government. A cheerful temper is like the genial sun, in whose warm rays all men love to bask. We read Neh. 8, 10: "Neither be ye sorry; for the joy of the Lord is your strength." Joy, gladness, is twice blessed; it blesses him who is glad, doing him good like medicine, and it has the quality of contagion, communicating itself to others. Some company is cold and frigid. Bright, cheerful company irradiates warmth to everybody; the winter is past, and the birds of good spirits begin to sing!

True, there is much suffering in the world. We live in a vale of tears. A Christian, too, has to suffer. How may this stream of woe be stopped? Whoever would stop this stream must stop the source; he must overcome sin. We can overcome sin only by believing in the divine Redeemer who has redeemed us from all sins, from death, and from the power of the devil. He is the only physician who can help you. Of Him you can take remedies for all ills and every suffering; with Him you can rejoice and say, "My heart beats with joy and cannot be depressed." Jesus can free us from worry and make our hearts truly cheerful.

**Jesus will not fail me,**
**Foes who would assail me**
**Cannot reach me here;**
**Though the earth be shaking,**
**Every heart be quaking,**
**Jesus calms my fear.**

*(To be continued.)*

# THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

## "Providentissimus Deus."

*The American Catholic Quarterly Review* (July, 1920), just out, reports: "Nine cardinals, many bishops, superiors-general of religious orders, abbots, and rectors of colleges attended the celebration of the silver jubilee of *Providentissimus Deus* by the Biblical Institute, Rome, on November 24, 1919. Father Aloysius G. da Fonseca, S. J., presented the history of events that led up to the encyclical; its content and effects — especially in the matter of Biblical inerrancy. Father J. B. Frey, S. Sp., a consulter of the Biblical Commission, spoke in the name of that legislative body on the principal doctrines propounded by the papal document." — The encyclical in question at the time of its publication dispelled the notion of the "liberalism" of Leo XIII. The "oppression" of Pius X, of which Catholic Modernists complain, is nothing but the application of the principles of Leo XIII, and the latter Pope, basing on the decisions of Trent and the Vatican that "God is the Author of Sacred Scripture," has simply "pressed this definition to its logical conclusion" when he said in *Providentissimus Deus* (November 18, 1893): "Hence it matters not at all that the Spirit chose men to be instruments with which to write; as it would matter if these inspired writers, though not the principal Author of Scripture, could fall into any error. For He by a supernatural energy so aroused and impelled them to write, and so aided them in writing, that they correctly thought out, and willed faithfully to write up, and fittingly set forth with infallible truth everything, and only that, which He ordained. Else He would not be the Author of all Scripture." The Roman Church seeks to crush every tendency to higher criticism in its midst. Its advocates have formed *l'école large,* in which Father Lagrange has been a leader whose writings have been prohibited in Roman seminaries. A number of Jesuit exegetes have "failed to measure up to all the later requirements of the Biblical Commission," appointed by the Pope for fighting higher criticism. Father Hummelauer, S. J., has been declared in error because he has distinguished in Old Testament history "popular tradition, primitive history, and history." Pope Benedict XV, on June 18, 1915, ratified the following decision of the Biblical Commission: "Bearing in mind the true idea of the apostolic office and St. Paul's undoubted fidelity to the teaching of the Master, likewise the Catholic dogma of the inspiration and inerrancy of Sacred Scripture (whereby all that the sacred writer asserts, enunciates, insinuates, must be held to be asserted, enunciated, insinuated by the Holy Spirit); and weighing well the texts of the Apostle, considered in themselves, fully in agreement with the way of speaking of the Lord Himself, must one affirm that the Apostle Paul, in his writings, said nothing at all that does not perfectly agree with that ignorance of the time of the Parousia which Christ Himself said was to be found in men? Reply: Yes." (*Acta Apostol. Sed.,* July 20, 1915.) The decrees of the Biblical Commission are found in the 11th edition of Denzinger-Bannwart's

*Enchiridion* (Freiburg i. Br., Herder, 1911) and in Leopold Fonck's (S. J.) *Documenta ad Pontificam Commissionem de Re Biblica Spectantia* (Rome, Biblical Institute, 1915). They have been published in an English translation by Father Cyril Gaul, O. S. B., in *Rome and the Study of Scripture; a Collection of Papal Enactments on the Study of Holy Scripture, together with the Decisions of the Biblical Commission.* (St. Meinrad, Indiana: Abbey Press, 1919.) Rome's fight against higher criticism is interesting; it seems to defend the orthodox position, and speaks the language of orthodoxy, *e. g.*, on inspiration; but it is not our fight; for it fights for a Bible which men have wantonly decreed shall be God's Word (the Latin Vulgate, with the heretical Apocrypha); it fights with weapons of human authority (papal decisions) and for a secular purpose (the maintenance of papal absolutism). D.

## Oxford's Olive Branch.

"To the Professors of the Arts and Sciences and to Members of the Universities and Learned Societies in Germany and Austria.

"Since there will be many of you who fully share our heartfelt sorrow and regret for the breach that the war has occasioned in our friendly intercourse, and since you cannot doubt the sincerity of the feeling which engendered and cherished that old friendliness, you must, we believe, be sharing our hope for its speedy reestablishment.

"We, therefore, the undersigned Doctors, Heads of Houses, Professors, and other Officers and Teachers in the University of Oxford, now personally approach you with the desire to dispel the embitterment of animosities that under the impulse of loyal patriotism may have passed between us.

"In the field where our arms are one, our enthusiasm the same, our rivalry and ambition generous, we can surely look to be reconciled; and the fellowship of learning offers a road which may — and if our spiritual ideals be alive, must — lead to a wider sympathy and better understanding between our kindred nations.

"While political dissensions are threatening to extinguish the honorable comity of the great European states, we pray that we may help to hasten that amicable reunion which civilization demands. *Impetret Ratio, Quod Dies Impetratura Est.*"

Dr. Titius of Goettingen publishes this communication in *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (December 4), and says that it has been signed by 55 men of literary fame. He calls attention to the fact that the "amicable relations" were not broken off by the learned men of Germany; that the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* continued even during the war to report impartially the literary products in enemy countries, and declares that this policy will be "adhered to despite the defamation of our people by foreign powers." Dr. Titius thinks he may assume that because of the wish that has been frequently expressed for an amicable reunion, "a juster estimation of our people will gradually assert itself." This is, indeed, a matter devoutly to be wished, but it can hardly be hoped for. As long as "the impulse of

loyal patriotism" embraces the telling of lies, patriots will continue to lie to bolster up the original falsehoods. What is wanted for a proper readjustment is not renewal of courtesies, but justice, and, above all, the merciless exposure of all the patriotic liars that were so prominent during the war, and, in the case of Christians, sincere repentance. D.

### More Bigots.

The Ku Klux Klan proposes to invade the North, not merely to terrorize the Northern Negro as it has the Southern, but to spread "one hundred per cent. Americanism," that is, of the K. K. K. brand. Its "Imperial Wizard," Col. W. J. Simmons, informs the public that membership in his triple K organization is restricted to "only native-born American citizens who believe in the tenets of the Christian religion and owe no allegiance to any foreign country, political institution, sect, or persons." This Krowd of Kontemptible Kowards should take a course in United States Constitution and go to a Christian Sunday-school. They know neither the basic law of our country nor the abc of the Christian religion. Their organization is mainly anti-Catholic and anti-Jew. The *Nation* (January 19) says: "No right-thinking American can regard the Klan as aught but the antithesis of everything decent for which this country stands." Correct! D.

### German Religious Schools Guaranteed by the Constitution.

Disregarding protests from the American Legion, Governor Russell of Mississippi has declared that he will permit 162,000 Mennonites from Canada to settle in his State, although they are conscientious objectors to war on religious grounds, and do not send their children to the public schools, but to their own private schools, where only German is taught and spoken. "I have guaranteed," says the Governor, "religious and educational freedom to the Mennonites. I am giving them a guarantee only of what the Constitution of the United States guarantees to every one who enters its doors." (The *Nation,* January 19.) This Governor is one hundred per cent. American. D.

### President Harding a Freemason.

In one evening President-elect Harding was, by special process, passed through thirty-one degrees of Freemasonry, and made a full-fledged Mason. His advancement in the lodge had been blocked years ago after the first degree by objectors. If he had not been elected President of the United States, he would most likely still be kept in the first degree. As chief executive of our country he has become valuable to the Masons, and they have secured him for themselves. A record of the proceedings in this instance is found in the *American Tyler-Keystone* for November, 1920, p. 169, and in the *Christian Cynosure* for November, 1920, p. 196. The *Ohio-Waisenfreund* remarks suggestively: "We wonder what Harding would say if some one were to ask him to turn Catholic." The *Lutherische Kirchen-*

*zeitung* (January 22), from which we have gleaned these facts, remarks editorially: "In recent times the (Freemasons') Lodge has become so strong that it dares to force every person who is elected President to become a member of its organization. According to the Constitution of our country no religious qualification is to be required of the incumbent of an office (of our Government). The Freemasons, however, set up the selfish claim that the President of our country must be a Freemason. They act as if membership in their lodge were an indispensable requisite for an efficient discharge of his office. This is infinite arrogance, to say no more. It is pertinent to ask: Why must the President be a member of this lodge? What compelling reason is there in this secret organization, and its secret doings and practises? Has Freemasonry become a dark, secret power that can dictate to the officers of our Government? This lodge makes it necessary for the President to take two oaths: one behind closed doors by which he becomes pledged to Freemasonry, the other at Washington. However, that is the very thing for which this mother of the brood of lodges is striving, — it wants to rule. The lodge rules in France, in England, in Italy, and wherever English and French influence asserts itself. Who can tell what part was acted by this dark, secret power during the late war? This chapter, too, will some day be lighted up. — Harding submitted; that is small honor for him. His action may show political prudence, and may secure him certain advantages among lodge people, but it is, in itself, simply contemptible. His submission reveals a weakness for which we have only profound regret. Religious considerations did not influence Harding. In a religious respect it is likely that he has lost little by his action. But there are other considerations, such as, liberty, independence, genuine Americanism. These, too, are of great value. But Harding has set aside these considerations and sold himself to the Freemasons. His precedent will exert an evil influence on the Church: it will draw many into the lodge. The Church is being weakened, and there is an effort made to force her to surrender to the lodge. Enough churches have already taken up a position beneath this secret tree. The process continues until the lodge has eaten out the heart of true religion from the Church. All other lodges aid in this endeavor, but the Freemasons lead in it."

D.

## Sunday Blue Laws.

*The Dearborn Independent* (January 15, 1921) offers some interesting data concerning the so-called "blue laws," the proposed reenactment of which has so recently stirred our nation. It says in part: —

"To Connecticut belongs the honor of being the home and originating point, in our country, of the blue laws. These were contained in what is known as the New Haven Statutes, framed from the strictest English and Scotch models.

"The casual student of history is more or less familiar with

these old Puritan Sunday laws. A man, for example, was forbidden to kiss his wife on the Lord's Day, nor could a woman kiss her child; he could not shave himself; run, or even saunter about in his own garden; no work could be done; even the cooking of the Sunday meals had to be performed on Saturday. The Puritan Sunday was a day of almost continuous religious exercises, reverent behavior, and sober conduct. The punishment meted out to the violators of the sundry Sunday laws was severe — flogging, the stocks, imprisonment, fine, and so on.

"And now to-day, as in olden times, a group of citizens of the United States has become suddenly appalled at the wickedness of our nation. A great reform wave is gathering head to make the world better. And the first action of the new Puritans is a plan to return to the Puritan Sunday, and we find ourselves in the midst of a great discussion, *pro* and *con*.

"The crusaders are hard at work at the nation's capital, where they are framing drastic legislation which they hope to get enacted. They are not entirely unpractical or unbusinesslike in their methods at Washington — neither do they boast that they expect to be victorious at once. This is to be their initial drive, and if they are able even to bring about the passage of laws restricting the Sunday amusements of the District of Columbia, they will be quite satisfied. Other reforms will come later. Supporting their organization in the Senate is Senator Jones of Washington, while in the House, Representative Temple of Pennsylvania is the champion of their viewpoint. Eventually they hope to pass an amendment to the Constitution, including a code for Sunday and for divorces. Prominent in the movement at Washington are Dr. E. C. Dinwiddie and Miss Laura B. Church, both noted for their aggressive work with the Anti-Saloon League."

In opposition to the proposed Sunday laws the article quotes Dr. Manning, rector of New York's famous old Trinity Church, as follows: —

"First, such a method would be an unwarranted invasion of proper individual liberty. We have no right to attempt to compel the observance of particular religious customs. It is right for the law to restrain needless business on Sunday so as to secure Sunday as a day of rest for all. As far as possible the law should give to all a day of freedom from ordinary occupations, a day which they may devote to religious observance, if they so desire. Further than this the law may not rightly go.

"Secondly, I object to any revival of the Puritan Sabbath in the interest of Sunday observance and in the very name of religion itself. A great deal of the present-day laxity is a reaction against the exaggerated severity of those times. The Puritan idea of Sunday was always a mistaken one, and it never represented a consensus of the opinion of the Church. It never represented more than the peculiar views of a relatively small class of Christians. There is

not a word in the New Testament which supports such an idea of the Sabbath. On the contrary, our Lord rebuked the Puritans of His day and told them that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." MUELLER.

### The Pope and the Iednota.

Concerning the recent movement in Czecho-Slovakia, centered in the clerical society called "Iednota," the *Biblical Review* (January, 1921), quoting Mr. Sherwood Eddy in the *Congregationalist,* writes: "In five months about 200,000 have joined the movement. The whole nation is now in a state of transition. A national Church like that of England may be formed. I have just met the national leader of this new movement. They have adopted for their services the national language; they stand for a married priesthood, an open Bible, and the whole position maintained by Hus at the beginning of the Reformation five centuries ago."

The attitude of the Roman Pontiff towards this new movement is clearly defined in an address held before the College of Cardinals, convened in secret session in the Vatican on December 16, 1920. In this address, which is published in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* (December, 1920), the Pope declares: 1) That having in vain tried to bring back the Czecho-Slovak priests to duty and sanity (*ad officium sanitatemque revocare,* p. 585), he most vehemently declares himself in favor of the decision of the bishops that the Iednota be dissolved (*ut generalis consociatio Cleri Czeci, Iednota quae dicitur, dissolveretur,* p. 586), and that in its place diocesan societies be organized under the jurisdiction of the bishops; 2) that where the Iednota have injured the discipline of the Church by preaching in the vernacular (*et ea in vulgus praedicando attulisset detrimentum ecclesiasticae disciplinae,* p. 586), the integrity of the Church, where it has been violated, be restored (*integritatem, ubi violatam vidissent, restituerent,* p. 586); 3) that, since to a large extent the power and glory of the Latin Church depends upon the celibacy of the priests (*Constat enim, si Latina viget floretque Ecclesia, magnam partem roboris gloriaeque eius ab ipso clericorum caelibatu manare,* p. 587), it should for this reason be carefully preserved; because *"fore numquam, ut haec Apostolica Sedes sanctissimam eam maximeque salutarem legem caelibatus ecclesiastici aliqua ex parte extenuando mitiget, nedum aboleat,"* p. 587; 4) that the innovations, which some have tried to introduce into the discipline of the Church, pertaining to the vernacular, shall never be approved by the Holy See (*Negamus eas, quas nonnulli contendunt inducere in Ecclesiae disciplinam, exactas ad popularem rationem, rerum novitates, unquam ab Apostolica Sede approbari posse*), p. 587. — This attitude of the Pope reminds one of the words of Luther, in which he says that because of the decrees of men there is to-day a greater bondage than has ever been under the Law. (St. L. IV, 670.) MUELLER.

# BOOK REVIEW.

*Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis:* —

1. **He Loved Me, and Gave Himself for Me.** For the Quiet Hour during Holy Week. *W. H. T. Dau.* 90 pages. 50 cts.

When the Rev. Charles A. Berry sat in his study in Bolton, Lancashire, England, late one night, a poor girl rang his door-bell. "Are you the minister?" she asked. "Yes." "Then I want you to come and get my mother in." Berry, thinking it was some drunken brawl, said, "You must get a policeman." "O no," said the girl, "my mother is dying, and I want you to get her into salvation." The girl lived about a mile and a half from Berry's residence. She was determined that he must come with her. He went. He found the place to be a house of ill fame. In the lower rooms people were drinking and telling lewd stories. Upstairs he found the poor woman dying. He sat down and talked to her about Jesus as the beautiful example and praised Him as a teacher and a leader. The woman looked at Berry out of her eyes of death and said, "Mister, that's no good for the likes of me. I don't want an example. I am a sinner." There Berry was face to face with a poor dying sinner and had no message of comfort and peace for her, no sweet Gospel of Him whose blood cleanses us from all sin. Berry then thought of what his mother had taught him, and he told the dying woman the old story of God's love in Christ, whether he himself believed it or not. "Now you are getting at it," said the woman. "That's what I want. That's the story for me." Berry later, in telling the story to a brother clergyman, said, "I got her in, and I got in myself."

This story, taken from life, brings to our attention anew how utterly helpless and comfortless those are who have "another gospel, which is not another," and a Jesus who exists only in the imagination and who is powerless to save from sin and death. "Let no man deceive you, friends," says Prof. Dau in his new Lenten booklet, "with sham exhibitions of a fictitious Jesus: the Jesus whom you really need is not the respectable gentleman to whom your honorable citizen would take off his hat, not the intellectual celebrity with whom your university man would spend an occasional hour, nor the pattern of moral perfection to whom your Pharisee would pay homage; nor the benevolent dispenser of rewards to whom the complacent churchgoer looks for the crown and the palms; nor the frenzied social worker who wants to save degraded men by soap and public baths and higher views of life. No; the Jesus whom you need is only He of whom you can say, 'He loved me, and gave Himself for me.' For Him let us raise again throughout the wide earth the call of the ancient seer, 'Look unto Him and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth.'" "It is the sacrifice which He offered in our place that makes Jesus what His name signifies: the Savior. This teaching of the vicarious living and dying of the Son of God for sinners is the Holy of Holies of the Christian religion. Jesus may be anything else, but He is no Savior to any person who does not accept Him as the divinely appointed proxy who effects the sinner's atonement with his offended God, that is, who makes God to be at one again with the sinner whom He had to curse." "This evangelical Jesus is the true Jesus of the Scriptures; every other Jesus that is pro-

claimed to men is a caricature, a Moses, or a Plato, or a moral reformer with a Christian cloak thrown around him. Such a Jesus will save no man, bring comfort to no human heart when the sorrow of all sorrows, the sorrow over one's sins, overwhelms it, but will only deepen its despondency and confirm it in despair." "The death of Jesus is embedded in the creeds of Christendom as a priceless jewel set in gold." "The offer of salvation by Jesus means simply that we accept Jesus Himself, not that we believe all manner of excellent things about Him."

To His disciples Jesus says, "Ye shall be witnesses unto Me . . . unto the uttermost part of the earth." The Lenten booklet by Prof. Dau is a bold and clear testimony unto Jesus, the only Savior, in these days when the light of the pure Gospel of salvation is not only very much obscured by false teachings of various kinds, but when, even in so-called Christian denominations and from so-called Christian pulpits and by so-called Christian preachers, often a Jesus is preached who "would be pronounced counterfeit by Jesus Himself: the Jesus of the hero-worshiper, the Jesus of the ethical culturist, the Jesus of the philanthropist, the Jesus of the altruist, the Jesus of the socialist, and a score of other Jesuses that are being exhibited on the lecture platform, in newspaper articles, in magazines, in novels, even on the screen in photo-plays."

The accusation which has been made, especially by the Roman Catholic Church, against those who teach the Scriptural doctrine of salvation by grace alone, namely, that thereby the Christian is given a license to sin, and that a life of good works is not encouraged and not given its proper valuation, has also been very well taken care of in Prof. Dau's admirable booklet. He says: "Thus received by faith, this Christ for us becomes the source of our holy endeavors. As from the vine the branches draw the sap that makes them bear fruit, so Jesus is the impelling force for our pure thinking, clean speech, and honest and loving acts." Prof. Dau speaks of "the nine thousand nine hundred and ninety-nine different ways of Christian feet-washing," and adds: "In this way the disciples' loyalty is put to proof. It is easy to be a soldier on dress parade, but the supreme test that shows what stuff the soldier is made of comes in the mud of the trenches and the carnage of the battlefield. It is delightful and affords a pretty sight to sit in your Sunday clothes in a beautiful church and listen to a tuneful choir, a magnificent organ, and an eloquent preacher; but to go out into the highways and behind the hedges and plead with the castaways and reprobates of humanity: 'Why will ye die?' — that requires all the force of a strong conviction within." "The service which the Master demands is a copy of His own life. 'Do as I have done!' that is the Master's comprehensive order."

The first of the seven brief Lenten addresses given in the booklet was delivered at Zion Lutheran Church, St. Louis, on Palm Sunday, 1910, and the others at the Noonday Lenten services at Wood's Theater in Chicago on Maundy Thursday and Good Friday, 1919 and 1920. In these Lenten addresses we do not hear the learned theological professor lecturing to his students, but the Gospel-preacher speaking in plain, simple, forceful language to the common people, proclaiming to them during the season of Lent the simple and wonderful message of the Savior. It is therefore not

a book written for preachers only. Our pastors will do well to put it into the hands of their people and encourage them to read it, especially during the season of Lent. It will also make an excellent gift for catechumens, in remembrance of their Day of Confirmation. FRITZ.

2. **Hold Fast That Which Thou Hast!** Words of Encouragement, Warning, and Admonition to Our Confirmed Youth. Adapted from *W. Ziethe.* 74 pages. 25 cts.; gilt edge, 35 cts.

This English adaptation from an acknowledged German standard is an improvement upon the original. Its contents are genuine food for the soul, and as regards form, the booklet is a delight to the eye.

3. **Lutheran School Journal** (*Schulblatt*). An Educational Monthly. 56th year. January, 1921.
4. **Young Lutherans' Magazine.** Vol. XX, No. 1.
5. **Lutheran Guide.** Vol. XXIX, No. 1.
6. **Lutherisches Kinder- und Jugendblatt.** 49. Jahrg., No. 1.
7. **Fuer die Kleinen.** 26. Jahrg., No. 1.

The editorial work on these periodicals for our teachers, youths, and children continues to be good, helpful, and inspiring.

8. **Psalm 97.** Cantata: Mixed Choir and Soli. *Ernst I. Erbe.* 80 cts.

This musical rendition of the majestic Ninety-Seventh Psalm is full of splendid chorus parts and tuneful melodies for every voice. D.

*The Gorham Press:* —

**Creation Ex Nihilo.** The Physical Universe a Finite and Temporal Entity. By *L. Franklin Gruber.* 316 pp., 5×7½.

This, if we mistake not, is one of the most notable contributions made by American Lutheranism to general apologetics. Dr. Gruber, who is a member of the United Lutheran Church, sets out to prove from premises of reason the creation of the world out of nothing. His argument may be summed up as follows: Materialistic science, and this includes the theory of Evolution, proceeds on the assumption that the universe has had no beginning, is eternal, and will endure forever. As a necessary corollary of this thesis, science assumes the infiniteness of the universe. In other words, the material universe is presumed to be infinite both in duration and in extent. Hence, in order to establish from scientific premises the creation of the world *ex nihilo,* it will be necessary to prove only that the universe is limited in space. Also, if it is proven that matter has only transitory existence, the scientific proof has been furnished that it has had an origin. The cogency of this is evident when it is understood that a created universe is necessarily limited in space, even as an eternal universe would necessarily be limitless. This, in outline, is the substratum of Dr. Gruber's argument.

In his book, Dr. Gruber first discusses the various speculative theories as to the origin of the universe, and these are contrasted with the Scriptural ideas of creation *ex nihilo.* In chapter 2 it is pointed out that even from the standpoint of science or of philosophy, the materialistic explanation is inadequate, since the materialistic scientist must continually assume as working hypotheses unproven theories that are at least as much matters

of faith as the Christian's God. The various naturalistic theories regarding the origin of life are examined and found untenable. In chapter 3 it is shown by a process of elimination that the universe must necessarily have been God-created. This section, in which the author sets forth the relations of matter and spirit, is in itself a very fine, though compressed, dialectic argument against materialism. In chapters 4 and 5 the finiteness of the universe is proven on the basis of generally accepted theories of astronomy. The reasoning especially from the aggregate light of the stars is very beautiful. (The reviewer must admit that he has not been able to check up on the mathematical illustrations pp. 129 to 144.) The temporal nature of the universe is treated in chapter 6 on the basis of what we know about energy and the laws of nature. This argument is continued in chapter 7, which contains many interesting and fascinating paragraphs in which the very latest researches of British, German, French, and American physicists are laid under contribution. Chapter 8 presents the argument from design. In this section one is somewhat disappointed with the limited space devoted to evidences of design in organic nature. The concluding chapter treats the testimony of Scripture and points out the absence of any real conflict between empirical science and revelation.

This, in general, suggests to the reader the line of argument contained in Dr. Gruber's thorough and learned discussion of the scientific argument for a finite, a created universe. The complete mastery of the latest theories in physical science, the beautiful articulation of the various lines of proof, the objective spirit in which the book is written, these qualities, in their conjunction, mark Dr. Gruber's book as a valuable contribution to general apologetics. GRAEBNER.

*A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung Werner Scholl, Leipzig, Germany:* —

**Die Echtheit des Johannesevangeliums mit besonderer Berueecksichtigung der neuesten kritischen Forschungen.** Ein Vortrag von *Lic. theol. Heinrich Appel*, Pastor in Kastorf, Mecklenburg-Schwerin.

In this publication of 37 pages Pastor Appel investigates the charges of modern higher critics (Bretschneider, Baur, Harnack, Juelicher, Bousset, Wellhausen, Heitmueller, Spitta, etc.) preferred against the authenticity of the Johannean gospel. Clearly, compactly, and convincingly the author states the proofs for the authorship of John, and strikingly demolishes the *Quellenhypothesen* of Wendt, Spitta, Schwartz, and other destructive critics. While we heartily recommend this lecture to the earnest perusal of such as are interested in this vital subject, we wish to call attention to several assertions with which every believer in the verbal inspiration of the Bible must find fault. Statements such as these: "Das zeigt sich auch dort, wo er die Synoptiker *korrigiert*," p. 30; "Und die ewigen Missverstaendnisse? Ging es bei diesen wichtigen Eroerterungen ohne solche ab? Dabei moegen sie von dem Evangelisten immerhin des oefteren ungeschickt zum Ausdruck gebracht sein," p. 33, really deny both the trustworthiness as well as the inspired character of the words of which the apostles themselves declare that they are the divine words of the divine Savior. MUELLER.